2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11

618 dimensions. The clan is also the region where a lineage's clanship ties have the maximum force; for, as we have seen, there are differences in the range and precision of the rights, obligations, and participation in the secular and ceremonial matters of common interest implied by the ties of clanship which a lineage has with other lineages.

A lineage's field of clanship is not homogeneous. As will become clearer when we have analysed one or two more chains of linked lineages, spatial distance and genealogical distance are the main factors upon which the incidence and variation of the rights and duties of clanship depend. The farther away a lineage lives from another with which it has ties of clanship, the less intercourse is there between their members and the less likely are they to co-operate in those situations and events which mobilize these ties. Again, the closer the genealogical links, actual, putative, or fictional, between two linked lineages the more regularly will they co-operate and the more effectively assert the rights and perform the duties of clanship.

The principles so far elicited have a general application throughout Taleland. But the clan of Mosuor biis is unique. The typical clan in Taleland is a single local unit of the composite kind. Mosuor biis are certainly the most numerous patrilineal descent group in Taleland.[1] It must not be forgotten that in addition to the four localized branches of the clan which form its recognized major subdivisions, there are the minor colonial offshoots.

618 811 The natives see no difficulty in explaining the numerical preponderance of Mosuor biis. It is, in their eyes, due simply to a fecundity greater than that of other lineages. Members of Mosuor biis themselves give this a mystical rationalization. They say that they are prolific because they all have but one religious cult, that of their ancestors, which binds them to one another in mutual amity and solidarity. In their cult of their ancestors each branch of Mosuor biis seeks not only its own increase and prosperity but the increase and prosperity of all its clan brethren as well. To do otherwise would be a sin inviting the wrath of the common ancestors of the whole clan. But in composite clans, they say, each component lineage has its own independent ancestral and other ritual cults. It is jealously concerned with its own increase and prosperity, even regarding it as an advantage if other maximal lineages of the same clan are diminished. Such an attitude brings down mystical retribution; for those who seek the ill of their fellow men are bound to suffer ill themselves.

618 These views are not accepted among members of composite clans, who consider their own cults to be no less founded on, and instrumental in

[162] [1] To take a complete census of the members of Mosuor biis, even of the male members only, would be impossibly laborious and time-consuming for an anthropological field-worker limited to a short stay in the country. Sample censuses were made at Tongo and Sie. Going by these and by recent counts made throughout Taleland by the Administration of the taxable male population, I should estimate the male members of Mosuor biis (including accessory lineages) as not less than 2,000. The women are so scattered, owing to patrilocal marriage, that it is impossible to estimate their numbers. No other clan in Taleland can, I should judge, reckon more than half this number of male members.

2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11

CHAPTER VI

THE STRUCTURAL RELATIONS OF THE TALIS

A General Point

162 A NUMERICAL estimate of the Namoos in Taleland cannot be made from the published census figures. In the Tongo district alone they would include, on a rough reckoning, over a third of the population; the rest are the Talis.

184 The Talis, as we have seen, are distinguished by name and by myths of origin from the Namoos. Close neighbours though they are, Talis and Namoos are distinctly segregated from one another by locality, and this is associated with clear-cut structural cleavages. It is necessary, however, to emphasize that Talis and Namoos are also inseparably bound to one another by ceremonial and politico-ritual ties. In addition, all Talis and all Namoos are connected with one another as individuals by an elaborate network of cognatic and affinal ties. In the present chapter we are concerned with the constituted social relations of the Talis amongst themselves, treated in isolation from the background of their social relations with the Namoos, but this background must be borne in mind.

The Clan Structure of Zubiuŋ

618 The clans and lineages of the Talis form corporate units of the same kind as those of the Namoos. They are connected with one another by a network of constituted ties of the same type as those that link Namoo clans and lineages in a chain system, but more elaborately distributed and articulated. Again, the paradigm applies generally, but the perspective of each clan and lineage is peculiar to itself. To keep the parallel with the Namoos we shall take as our starting-point the group of Talis most intimately associated with Tongo, the people of Zubiuŋ (Zubiuŋdɛm).[1]

621 As we have previously mentioned, the people of Zubiuŋ live in such close contiguity with the Tongo Namoos that anyone ignorant of the structure of the community would be unable to draw a line between the homesteads of one group and those of the other. Investigation shows that Zubiuŋ homesteads form an irregular but continuous aggregate, quite distinct, spatially, from Tongo. The nearest Tongo neighbours of Zubiuŋ are the accessory Tongo lineage of Nɔŋsuur yidɛm. Consistently with the basic principles of Tale clanship, Nɔŋsuur yidɛm have an intercalary status between Tongo and Zubiuŋ. The legend which relates that the ancestor of Nɔŋsuur yidɛm was a sororal nephew (*ahɔŋ*) of Zubiuŋ is the rationalization of their intercalary role. But though they mediate between Tongo and Zubiuŋ in political matters, for example, they have no ties of clanship with the latter, as we have previously seen.

618 Zubiuŋ consists of three maximal lineages, residentially distributed in a way that exactly parallels their structural relations. The homesteads of

[162]

[1] Total male members, at home and abroad, about 250.

2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11

the former; and Biuŋ, with 25 homesteads and less than 400 inhabitants, is a peripheral settlement of the same type as Datɔk, which has over 600 homesteads and between 5,000 and 6,000 inhabitants. The whole of Biuŋ can be seen from one of the hummocks on which it stands, but it takes an hour's ride on horseback to get round the whole of Datɔk.

The density and distribution of habitation varies somewhat from one part of the country to another. The broad undulating plain on the north side of the Tong Hills permits of dense settlement, whereas the plain stretching south and south-east of the hills carries a relatively sparse population.[1]

Differences of altitude and of drainage probably explain this. During the rains a large part of the southern plain becomes too waterlogged for cultivation or for human habitation. Many of the Hill Talis went to live there when they were dispersed in 1911.[2] Though they have always cultivated bush farms there, wherever the lie of the land is suitable, they look back on their exile as a doubly miserable interlude on account of the uncomfortable and unhealthy conditions in which they had perforce to live. Accustomed to their well-drained hills, they hated the interminable swamp, as it seemed to them, into which the plain is transformed during the rains; and hardened though they are, they found the mosquitoes and other noxious insects that swarm there during this season an intolerable plague.

From the top of the Tong Hills, looking northwards, one has a view of what seems to be an endless plain, dotted meagrely with trees, and studded closely, as far as the eye can reach, with homesteads. They are identical in appearance, squat, circular, drab-grey or red, like the soil itself, mostly thatch-roofed, and seem to be scattered indiscriminately, some close together, others farther apart. There is nothing to indicate where one settlement ends and the next begins. Homesteads here, in the old settlements, are often no more than 20 yards apart.

The density of population is greater in the old than in the new settlements, and greater in the vicinity of the Tong Hills than in settlements nearer to the periphery. I cannot state how great the difference is, as I had neither the time nor the training for a comprehensive demographic survey. Sociological observation suggests that the amount of arable land available is an important factor, though not the only one, determining density of population in the older areas of settlement. This is as one would expect of a sedentary population of subsistence farmers. In the new settlements there is ample land, and men have large home farms immediately adjoining their homesteads, which are therefore often as

[1] I have no exact figures. From the statistics given in the census of 1931 (*Appendices containing Comparative Returns and General Statistics of the 1931 Census, Gold Coast*, Government Printer, 1932) it appears that the large area lying between Pwalɔg (Kpalɔg), the centre of the Tong Hills, and a straight line from there to the Red and White Volta—that is, this southern plain—had about 5,000 inhabitants in 1931, only one-seventh of the total population of Taleland. This included many people who were then in exile and now live on and around the Tong Hills.

[2] By order of the British Administration, after the punitive expedition against them. Cf. p. 12 above.

3: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1949
FE11 Tallensi FE11

596 The characteristic domestic family of the Tallensi is the agnatic joint family, and other forms of domestic group appear as phases in the growth cycle of a joint family. In a random sample of sixty-one domestic families from Tongo and the settlements adjacent to it, recorded in 1934, forty-one, or about two-thirds of these, were joint families.[1] A joint family consists of two or more close agnates, members of a single effective minimal lineage in all but exceptional cases, and often comprising all the members of a particular effective minimal lineage, together with their wives, children, and other dependants, if any,

[1] This sample of 61 domestic families which is cited throughout this chapter, includes domestic families from 5 clans, but the majority are from Tongo. A similar sample taken in the Sie district gave approximately the same results. As has been mentioned, about two-thirds of these families were joint families. The remainder were either elementary families (i.e. consisting of a man, his wife or wives, and his young children) which had been parts of joint families 5 or 10 years previously and would probably become joint families again in a decade or so; or they were joint families augmented by one or two close agnates of the family head and their dependants, or by other kinsmen. Such an augmented joint family functions in the same way as a joint family in the narrow sense. Thus if the time factor is taken into account all Tale domestic families can be described as joint families.

The composition of the joint family can be regarded from a slightly different angle, which supplements what has just been said. Considering the family from the point of view of the relationship of the head to the other male members, our sample breaks up as follows:

11 elementary families (1 man, wife or wives, occasionally his mother, and his young children).
22 families in which the head was the father of the other adult male(s).
25 families in which the head was the older brother of one or more of the other adult males.
3 families in which the head was the grandfather of one or all the other adult males.

The commonest type, it will be seen, is the joint family presided over by either a 'father' or the senior amongst a group of brothers.

● [162] The mean number of persons (men, women, and children) per domestic family of our sample is 10·4, distributed as follows:

Number of persons per family

	1–5	6–10	11–15	16–20	21–5	Total
Frequency	8	28	17	4	4	61

The mean number of adult males (i.e. over 18, approximately) per family is 2·6; of wives, including widows of deceased members, 3·4; of minors, including adolescent daughters, 4·4. The frequency distributions are as follows:

Number per family

Frequency of	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Adult males .	0	10	25	13	7	4	0	2	..	..	..	..	..	61
Wives . .	0	6	16	14	13	4	3	3	0	2	..	..	..	61
Minors . .	2	4	11	9	11	8	4	4	1	3	2	1	1	61

3: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1949
FE11 Tallensi FE11

occupying a single homestead. All the men of a joint family are therefore related to one another through a common father or grandfather or, infrequently, great-grandfather. A joint family may consist of two or more brothers (full or half-brothers or paternal cousins), with their wives and children, and perhaps an old mother; or a man and some or all of his married sons with their wives and children, together with unmarried sons and other dependants; or an old man, some or all of his married sons and grandsons, with their wives and children and other dependants —'sons' and 'grandsons' in the last two classes being understood in the native classificatory sense as including both own and deceased brothers' sons and grandsons. Joint families of the last-mentioned class are not very common. Here and there one meets a joint family combining features of two classes or having a rather wider range of agnates or other male kin; but these are unusual.

A joint family is obviously a composite unit. If the subordinate families constituting it are taken separately, some or all may be monogynous, elementary families; but one or more of the male members may have more than one wife, and there will thus be subordinate polygynous families within the joint family. For though a Talən starts his career as a family man with only one wife, his aim and ideal, throughout his life, is to have as many wives as he can afford. Actually, judging by the previously quoted sample,[1] the incidence of polygyny among the

[1] The following table sets out the relevant figures:

Table showing the Distribution of Wives of 146 Men over 18 Years of Age, belonging to 61 Domestic Families

Estimated age of men	Married men: Number of wives 1	2	3	4	5	Total men	Single men: Unmarried	Widowers or deserted
18–30	32	3	..	..	..	35	18 (most under 30)	17 (most over 30)
31–45	21	13	3	2	..	39		
46 and over	14	14	3	5	1	37		
Totals	67	30	6	7	1	111	18	17
							35	

Percentages	1	2	3	4	5	Total 146 men: 76% married	24% single
Of whole sample	[illegible]	20·5	4·1	4·8	0·7		
Of married men	60·4	27	5·4	6·3	0·9		

The table shows the distribution of effective wives, i.e. wives who fulfil both the sexual and the economic duties due from a wife, or, in a few cases, at least the economic duties. There were 9 non-effective wives, in addition, in this group: 3 incapacitated by leprosy or other chronic disease; 1 senile; 3 elderly women nominally inherited by their late husbands' younger brothers but

3: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1949
FE11 Tallensi FE11

596 Tallensi is only about 40 per 100 married men and two out of three
595 polygynists have only two wives. The modal number of wives is one.

Moreover, plurality of wives is mainly the privilege of older men, because they have both more resources and a longer marital history than the young men. Three-quarters of the married men under 45 have only one wife each.

596 A joint family is an organized economic and jural unit forming a single household under the authority of the oldest by age or generation of the group of agnates upon which it is based. Its component families are its segments, ordered and articulated in conformity with the lineage relations binding this group of men to one another. This appears in the layout of the homestead. The head of the joint family is the hub of the whole house, as we have seen, and each wife has her own quarters. It is shown, for example, in the fact that a young married son with no children, or only one or two infant children, generally occupies one of the rooms in his mother's *dug*, or, if his mother is dead, in the senior *dugdaana*'s *dug*; for his conjugal family counts, as yet, only as a segment of this *dug* in the social and economic organization of the house.

Taken over a long enough period, the joint family is seen to be a transitory unit. As the younger male members grow up, marry, and have children of their own, inner tensions begin to assert themselves and a tendency to split up appears. If fission does not occur in the lifetime of the head of the joint family, it is almost invariably precipitated by his death. Some or all of the component families then set up in their own independent homesteads, though it may be some years before complete dispersion supervenes. Thus it happens that an elementary family, which was at one time a part of a joint family, comes to occupy its own

●162 residing with grown-up sons; 2 inherited wives who had not yet joined the menage of their new husbands and were unlikely to do so for a considerable time, if at all. Seven of these non-effective wives were the wives of men in the 46 *plus* group. If these are reckoned as well, the distribution is altered somewhat in favour of the polygynists. There would then, for instance, be 3 men with 5 wives each.

In addition to the 111 married men, this sample of domestic families includes 35 single men, 18 of whom, mostly young men, had never been properly married, and 17 of whom were single at the time of the census, owing to the death or desertion of their wives.

Estimates of age given here and elsewhere in this book are very approximate. The difficulties of guessing the age of Africans in societies where chronological age is taken no notice of are well known. In making the above estimates I took the Tong Hills Expedition of 1911 as a base-line. From what I was told of the appearance, size, and activities of a person at the time of that well-remembered event, a guess could be made at his or her probable age in 1934. If one person's approximate age was established in this way, others who were agreed to be his or her contemporaries could be put into the same age-group. For example, the age-group 18–30 includes a number of men who said they were babes in arms in 1911, and the age-group 46 *plus* includes all those who were young married men in 1911.

3: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1949
FE11 Tallensi FE11

592 A domestic unit is most clearly identified by the fact that it has a single common gateway. Though the three domains of domestic organization are not absolutely congruent, the commonest residential unit is the single household, which is also a single though not necessarily completely independent jural and ceremonial unit.[1]

596 We have been considering the typical development of the joint family as a process of successive fission and dispersion. But the contrary process of reintegration also plays an important part in this development. The changes in the composition of the joint or expanded family that lead to changes in the status and social roles of its senior male members cause it to split up in the circumstances that have been indicated, but they lead to a fusion of independent units in other circumstances. The decisive factors are jural status in the lineage, with which go rights over patrimonial land, and economic capacity.

Let us take a sample case. When Katiŋoo died (see genealogy, p. 68) his eldest son Duun became head of the effective minimal lineage and joint family and inherited the patrimonial farm-land. Duun and his full brother Baa continued to occupy their father's homestead, using only one gateway. After a while—four or five years, perhaps—Baa asked to be allowed to farm for himself as his children were growing up. He still occupied the same homestead as Duun, but his quarters were separated from those of Duun by a high party wall (*beŋər*), he had his own granary, farmed for himself, and was solely responsible for supplying the food and other wants of his wives and children. The domestic family now consisted of two households.

[1] The following table shows this clearly:

162 *Table showing the Distribution of Domestic Families (= Gateways) and Households (= Units of Food Economy) in relation to Homesteads*

Domestic families per homestead	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Totals
No. of homesteads	34	5	4	0	1	0	0	0	44
No. of domestic families	34	10	12	0	5	0	0	0	61
Households per homestead	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**Totals**
No. of homesteads	25	11	4	2	0	1	0	1	44
No. of households	25	22	12	8	0	6	0	8	81

(Mean number of persons: per homestead, 14·5; per domestic family, 10·4.)

The 61 domestic families of our sample occupy 44 homesteads. On the average there are 1·4 gateways (i.e. 1·4 domestic families) per homestead; but more than half of the 61 families occupy their own homesteads, with one gateway apiece. There are 81 households in the sample group, an average of 1·9 households per homestead and 1·3 households per domestic family. But nearly a third of these households are single domestic families dwelling in their own homesteads.

7:Lynn G-5 (1932-1936) 1937 FE11 Tallensi FE11

allotted by the father. On the death of the head of the family the male survivors inherit the land in varying proportions as tenants in common with benefits of survivorship. The eldest son assumes the responsibilities of his father and may elect to live either in his father's compound, or to remain in his own. In either case he will receive a large share of his father's farm and retain also an interest in his own. After a number of generations the distribution and ownership of land becomes very complicated in congested areas and considerable fragmentation of holdings takes place. Land not in use may be lent to another for farming, but often with a stipulation to plant non-exhausting crops.

Distribution of Population.

The distribution of population is very variable both from one political area to another and within each area. If one takes the the district as a whole, 3,559 square miles, the population by the 1931 census (7) is shown to be 406,566 persons; this gives a density of population of 114 per square mile (c.f. South Mamprusi 23 per square mile, and Western Dagomba 15). It is estimated that at least one-third of the total area is uninhabited, and much of this is fertile alluvial land near to rivers, where tse-tse flies abound. In other areas ruins are found for which slave raiding, sleeping sickness, and yellow fever, are variously held responsible. Table I below gives the distribution of tribes and population.

Table 1.—Distribution of Population in North Mamprusi.

Political Area	Area, square miles	Total Population	Density of Population per sq. ml.	Tribes
Navrongo ...	1,551	120,870	78	Nankani, Kassena, and Builsa.
Zuarungu ...	781	133,981	172	Nankani, Tallensi, and Nabdam.
Kusasi and Br. Togoland ...	807 420	110,614 41,101	137 98	Kusasi, Busanga, Bemoba and strangers.
Total ...	3,559	406,566	114	—

Political Organisation.

History shows that North Mamprusi was continually harrassed from outside (8) until comparatively recent times. The Mamprusis in the South, who were at one time a powerful and organised tribe,

7:Lynn G-5 (1932-1936) 1937 FE11 Tallensi FE11

APPENDIX II—TABLE 1.

ZUARUNGU AREA.

241
311
●162

Details of areas farmed (in acres), men farming and persons supported for 29 compounds recorded at 5 centres in Zuarungu Area in 1932.

(Note.—The area of land occupied by buildings and waste land is not included.)

Compound No. and Name of Owner	Area farmed				No. men farming	Area per man	No. persons supported	Area per person
	Compound Farm	Separate "not bush"	Bush Farm	Total				
Bongo—								
I. Ayanbiri...	.53	2.00 1.65 .37 .14 .47	–	* 5.16	1	5.16	10	.51
II. Akani ...	2.89	.67 2.00 .42	– –	* 5.98	1	5.98	4	1.49
III. Inyaba ...	1.04	1.89	–	2.93	2	1.46	5	.58
IV. Aganda ...	6.71	.57	–	7.28	7	1.04	20	.36
V. Akawiboku	1.32	.54	–	1.86	3	**.62	8	.23
VI. Afuki ...	2.98	1.00 .50 1.45 2.03	–	7.96	4	1.99	13	.61
Totals ...	15.47	15.70	–	31.17	18	–	60	–
Means ...	2.58	2.61	–	5.19	3	1.73	10	.51
Nangodi—								
I. Doliba ...	1.62	1.57 .09	–	3.28	3	1.09	7	.47
II. Tobiga ...	13.25	.09	2.67	16.01	5	3.20	36	.44
III. Bugari ...	5.27	–	2.62	7.89	4	1.97	15	.51
IV. Banitami	3.54	–	2.36	5.90	2	2.95	7	.84
V. Babila ...	3.88	–	3.04	6.92	6	1.15	19	.36
Totals ...	27.56	1.75	10.69	40.00	20	–	84	–
Means ...	5.51	.35	2.14	8.00	4	2.00	16.8	.48

7:Lynn G-5 (1932-1936) 1937 FE11 Tallensi FE11

APPENDIX II—TABLE 1 (continued).

241
311
162

Compound No. and Name of Owner	Area farmed				No. men farming	Area per man	No. persons supported	Area per person
	Compound Farm	Separate "not bush"	Bush Farm	Total				
Sambrugo—								
I. Kasalaga	5.59	.99 .90 .26 .45	–	8.19	8	1.02	15	.61
II. Alori ...	2.78	.65 .20 .32 1.00 .51	–	5.46	5	1.09	13	.42
III. Asoro ...	5.50	1.07 .53 .68	–	7.78	3	2.59	11	.73
IV. Ayarina	8.57	.34	–	***8.91	2	4.45	7	1.27
V. Kolgo ...	4.01	1.34	–	5.35	2	2.67	6	.89
Totals ...	26.45	9.24	–	35.69	20	–	52	–
Means ...	5.29	1.85	–	7.14	4	1.78	10.4	.65
Tongo—								
I. Yembila ...	2.48	2.74	–	5.22	1	5.22	4	1.30
II. Zukori ...	3.82	.45 .59	5.96 4.83 5.65	21.30	7	3.04	36	.59
III. Omara ...	1.68	.61 .65	5.25	8.19	6	1.36	23	.35
IV. Dagbana...	6.43	.46 .51 .68	–	8.08	3	2.69	13	.62
V. Goloma ...	5.98	2.50	–	8.48	6	1.41	19	.44
Totals ...	20.39	9.19	21.69	51.27	23	–	95	–
Means ...	4.08	1.84	4.34	10.25	4.6	2.23	19	.54
Zuarungu—								
I. Adachama	9.25	3.89 .86	–	14.00	4	[illegible]	23	.60
II. Abagna ...	5.61	–	–	5.61	2	2.8	10	.56
III. Azogadugu	2.37	–	–	2.37	1	2.37	6	.39
IV. Awuni ...	3.22	–	–	3.22	2	1.61	10	.32
V. Atia ...	2.75	–	–	2.75	1	2.75	3	.92
VI. Asoro ...	7.56	–	–	7.56	4	1.98	8	.99
VII. Abugbiri	2.04	–	1.01	3.05	2	1.52	9	.34
VIII. Ayenpam	1.44	–	1.04	2.48	1	2.48	6	.41
Totals ...	34.24	4.75	2.05	41.04	17	–	75	–
Means ...	4.28	.59	.26	5.13	2.1	2.44	9.4	.55
SUMMARY OF DATA FOR 29 COMPOUNDS IN ZUARUNGU AREA								
Totals ...	124.11	40.63	34.45	199.17	98	–	366	–
Means ...	4.28	1.40	1.19	6.87	3.7	2.03	12.6	.54

*Receive assistance. **Two men very old. ***Poor, eroded land.

7:Lynn G-5 (1932-1936) 1937 FE11 Tallensi FE11

APPENDIX II—TABLE 2 (continued).

Compound No. and Name of Owner	Area farmed				No. men farming	Area per man	No. persons supported	Area per person
	Compound Farm	Separate "not bush"	Bush Farm	Total				
Wiaga—								
I. Abasu ...	3.12	.76 .46	–	4.34	3	1.45	10	.43
II. Akulbalmni	4.62	.89 .77 .57	–	6.85	2	3.43	8	.86
III. Anisedi ...	1.07	3.20	–	4.27	1	4.27	4	1.07
IV. Amanyadi	3.99	2.03	–	6.02	4	1.51	9	.67
V. Azurumi	2.86	1.01	–	3.87	2	1.94	12	.32
VI. Ansodi ...	1.67	.37	–	2.24	1	2.24	9	.25
Totals ...	17.53	10.06	–	27.59	13	–	52	–
Means ...	–	–	–	4.59	2.1	2.12	8.6	.53
SUMMARY OF DATA FOR 20 COMPOUNDS IN NAVRONGO AREA								
Totals ...	110.51	23.12	29.97	163.60	54	–	217	–
Means ...	5.52	1.16	1.49	8.19	2.7	3.03	10.8	.75

*Farmed very extensively. **One man a tailor.

APPENDIX II—TABLE 3.

KUSASI AREA.

Details of areas, men farming, and persons supported at Zebilla. Surveyed 1936.

Compound No. and Name of Owner	Areas farmed, in acres				No. men farming	Area per man	No. persons supported	Area per person
	Compound Farm	Separate "not bush"	Bush Farm	Total				
Zebilla—								
I. Mbila ...	1.58	–	6.37	7.95	1	8.18	4	2.04
II. Abila ...	4.62	–	9.62	14.24	6	2.4	22	.65
III. Agbanbila	4.26	–	4.30	8.56	4	2.16	9	.96
IV. Akoberi ...	14.70	5.94	3.76	24.40	6	4.31	17	1.53
V. Aroko ...	4.22	3.23	5.71	13.16	4	3.30	15	.88
Totals ...	29.38	9.17	29.76	68.31	21	–	67	–
Means ...	5.88	1.83	5.95	13.66	4.2	3.25	13.4	1.02

241
311
•162

7:Lynn G-5 (1932-1936) 1937 FE11 Tallensi FE11

APPENDIX II—TABLE 4.

Summary of Tables 1—3 giving totals and means for 54 compounds surveyed at ten centres in North Mamprusi. (Allowance has been made in areas for land occupied by buildings or waste land. "Persons supported" includes adults and children, except babes in arms.)

District and Centre of Record	No. of Compound	Area farmed in acres				Total Number men farming	Area per man	Total Number persons supported	Area per person	Compound Means			Persons supported per man
		Compound Farm	Farm away *not* bush	Bush Farms	Total Area					Area farmed	Men farming	Persons supported	
Zuarungu Area—													
Bongo ...	6	15.47	15.70	—	31.17	18	1.73	60	.51	5.19	3	10	3.3
Nangodi ...	5	27.56	1.75	10.69	40.00	20	2.00	84	.48	8.00	4	16.8	4.2
Sambruno ...	5	26.45	9.24	—	35.69	20	1.78	52	.65	7.14	4	10.4	2.6
Tongo ...	5	20.39	9.19	21.69	51.27	23	2.23	95	.54	10.25	4.6	19	4.1
Zuarungu ...	8	34.24	4.75	2.05	41.04	17	2.44	75	.55	5.13	2.1	9.4	4.4
Navrongo Area—													
Chana ...	6	54.33	1.41	—	55.74	16	3.48	49	1.14	9.29	2.6	8.1	3.1
Kologo ...	6	29.75	5.09	29.97	64.81	16	4.05	83	.78	10.80	2.6	12.9	4.9
Navrongo ...	2	8.90	6.56	—	15.46	9	1.74	33	.47	7.73	4.5	16.5	3.6
Wiaga ...	6	17.53	10.06	—	27.59	13	2.12	52	.53	4.59	2.1	8.6	4.1
Kusasi Area—													
Zebilla ...	5	29.38	9.17	29.76	68.31	21	3.25	67	1.02	13.66	4.2	13.4	3.2
Totals ...	54	264.00	72.92	94.16	431.08	173	—	650	—	—	—	—	—
Means ...	—	4.89	1.35	1.74	7.98	3.2	2.49	12	.66	7.98	3.2	12	3.7
		61%	17%	22%									